

# Italo-Celtic Revisited

Calvert Watkins

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The notion of Italo-Celtic unity was born in 1861, in a study by C. Lottner, *Kuhns Beiträge* 2.309 ff. It grew and flourished over three-quarters of a century, primarily under the patronage of the greatest Indo-Europeanist of the age, Antoine Meillet. And it was buried in 1929 by C. Marstrander in a "diskusjon" in *NTS* 3.241–259. Since then it has been resurrected and buried again, more than once.<sup>1</sup> Its ghost evidently lives on; otherwise we may assume it would not have been deemed worthy of figuring among the topics for this conference.

From their very beginnings, Indo-European studies have been faced with a problem. We have the several attested languages; the number and precision of the similarities among these languages are such that they cannot be due to chance. It is this "one fact"<sup>2</sup> that indicates the hypothesis of a common origin. The immediate question is, then, how we are to envisage the historical passage from this common original to the divergent attested languages—"wie es eigentlich gewesen."

The first answer was Schleicher's *Stammbaum* (of 1861), which was followed shortly—though never completely replaced—by Schmidt's *Wellen* of 1872. Both of these theories are an attempt to answer the question, What are the relationships of the attested Indo-European

<sup>1</sup> Compare the following, which is only a partial listing: G. Devoto, *Silloge linguistica Ascoli* 200–240 (Torino, 1929); G. Bonfante, *I dialetti indo-europei* (Naples, 1931); F. Ribezzo, *Rivista indo-greco-italica* 16.27–40 (1932); A. Meillet, *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*<sup>3</sup>, chap. 3 (Paris, 1933); J. Vendryes, *La position linguistique du celtique* (Rhys lecture, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 23 [1937]); J. Whatmough, *Foundations of Roman Italy* 116 (London, 1937); T. Boellé, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, Ser. 2, 9.97–120 (1940); Whatmough, *HSCP* 55.19–20 (1944); M. Dillon, *AJP* 64.124–134 (1944); Devoto, *Gli antichi italici*<sup>2</sup> 44–47 (Firenze, 1951); E. Pulgram, *Studies presented to Joshua Whatmough* 246–247 (*The Hague*, 1957); Pulgram, *The Tongues of Italy* 229–230 (Cambridge, Mass., 1958). For a broader view of the positions of Italic and Celtic in Indo-European, cf. H. Krahe, *Sprache und Vorzeit* (Heidelberg, 1954); W. Porzig, *Die Gliederung des idg. Sprachgebiets* 93–151 (Heidelberg, 1954); V. V. Ivanov, *Vopr. jaz.* 1956.111–121.

<sup>2</sup> To use the expression of O. Szemerényi, *Trends and tasks in comparative philology* 7 (London, 1962).

languages among themselves? Can they be arranged in subgroups? Schmidt's hypothesis had the great merit of introducing a geographical frame to the earlier rather disembodied notions of linguistic subgroups, and the subsequent development of dialectology has reinforced this manner of envisaging the relations of the Indo-European languages. In particular the contribution of dialectology has been the isogloss, the linguistic feature shared between two languages that are, were, or may be presumed to have been, in contact. The isogloss is the expression for what has long been and continues to be<sup>3</sup> the primary criterion for linguistic subgrouping: the common innovation.

The common innovation is so firmly anchored in traditional linguistic thinking that to question its utility smacks of lèse majesté. But one may be permitted to suggest that it is overemphasized. For to consider common innovations alone in subgrouping, and to ignore common retentions, is possible only if we consider language as a mechanical sum of linguistic features, some of which "change" and some of which do not—the atomistic view of the neogrammarians. It is inconsistent with the concept of language as a structured system, and of linguistic history as a succession of systems. At any given stage of a given language, retentions and innovations are part of the same synchronic structure. If two languages agree in maintaining the productivity of a given structural feature, rather than replacing it by something else, we may well have in this retention a primary dialectal datum. It is precisely this notion of the importance of common retentions as evidence for Italo-Celtic unity which Meillet maintained, in the addendum to the second edition of his *Esquisse d'une histoire de la langue latine*, "Chronologie des langues européennes." His remarks have been interpreted as a quasi renunciation of the notion of Italo-Celtic unity (Bolelli, *op. cit.* 106), but this is incorrect; in the third edition, the addendum was incorporated into the body of the text, but the notion of an Italo-Celtic unity was maintained. Meillet saw that the agreement of Italic and Celtic alone in retaining the subjunctive in -ā-,<sup>4</sup> or of the passive in -r (shared with other languages), is a primary datum; the importance of this point for historical linguistic methodology cannot be overlooked.

I would add another point. Lists of innovations very nearly always contain only "positive" features: particular shapes of morphemes, such

<sup>3</sup> Cf. H. M. Hoenigswald, *Language change and linguistic reconstruction* 151 (Chicago, 1960).

<sup>4</sup> "Le procédé a un aspect profondément indo-européen," *Les dialectes indo-européens*<sup>2</sup>, avant-propos, p. 3. His view is confirmed by that of N. Trubetzkoy and E. Benveniste (see *BSL* 47.11–20 [1951]); I cannot agree with the dissenting views of G. S. Lane, *Lg.* 38. 245–253 (1962).

as the Italic and Celtic gen. *-ā*, superl. *-samo-*, deverbal suffix *-ti* + *ō/n-*, and so forth. But what we may call “negative” innovations are equally important. We must always ask ourselves, what has the given language restricted or eliminated? Celtic and Italic agree remarkably in having severely limited the productivity of deverbal nouns of the type *τεμ-* → *τομός/τομή*, while retaining enough isolated examples to show that this morphophonemic derivational pattern once existed in these languages. The innovation of the suffix *-ti* + *ō/n-*, and its fortune as deverbal formation, is in a certain sense only a consequence of the primary innovation of eliminating deverbal nouns in *CeC-* → *CoCo/ā-*. The history of the suffix *-tiō/n-* is complex in Italic and Celtic, and not nearly so parallel in the two groups as the outward form would appear: we have also *-iō/n-* in archaic forms like Lat. *ūsucapiō*, and OIr. *Ériu* ‘Ireland’, *triū* ‘land’; and the functional opposition *-tiō* : *-tu-* in Latin (continuing IE *-ti-* : *-tu-*) appears unknown in Celtic. The implementations of the suffix in Latin and in Celtic are not parallel; while *-tiō* is the principal deverbal suffix in Latin, *-tiu* is relatively infrequent in Celtic. If the structural contexts are not comparable, then an isolated identity such as *-tiō* : *-tiu* is not significant. In Latin, we know that *-tiō* replaced *-iō* in many cases, cf. *paciō* (Festus) → *pactiō*, which also weakens the comparison. Considering that *-tiō/n-* has affinities also in Armenian (H. Pedersen, *KZ* 38.220 [1905]), it is best to leave it out of the Italo-Celtic question and consider only the negative innovation as significant.

There is a third historical “component” of any language which must be considered in any question of dialectal relations with other languages: “divergence,” or what is shared with no language of the family. On the face of it, this seems obvious. But in fact, in most of the literature on linguistic subgrouping, all the attention is given to the similarities between languages, and little or none to the differences. The two must be balanced against each other; the probative force of a few striking “common innovations” of a pair of languages is considerably weakened if they can be set against a large number of structurally significant divergences between the two. It is the neglect of this aspect of the problem, more than any other single factor, which in my opinion vitiates the concept of an Italo-Celtic unity.

In the question of subgrouping, as in any other linguistic problem, we must consider the total structure of the languages under investigation. In particular, it is of the greatest importance *where* in the system any of these features—shared retentions, shared innovations, and divergences—are. To use the generative model, which may be profitably applied to dialectal problems, we may ask, How early is the rule? Relative depth

in the structure is an index of relative antiquity.<sup>5</sup> The subgrouping question is partly one of relative chronology. If the features shared by two languages—and here I would include both retentions and innovations—are older, and more deeply imbedded in their structures than are the divergences between them, then we may speak of a “unity.” But this “unity,” e.g., Indo-Iranian, is primarily terminological; there is no question of a “single common language,” though in “real” terms we might speak of a definable dialect area. The term “unity” as thus used simply expresses certain chronological relations between shared features and divergences. As Benveniste has stated (*Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen* 2 [Paris, 1935]), “La fixation d’une chronologie devra être la préoccupation dominante des comparatistes.”<sup>6</sup>

Italic and Celtic are closely related. This is universally admitted by Indo-Europeanists, and will be taken for granted here. This fact, determined simply by inspection, is one necessary condition for making the hypothesis of an Italo-Celtic unity. The other necessary condition is that Italic and Celtic may themselves be reduced to the unities of Common Italic and Common Celtic. Common Celtic would appear to present no difficulty;<sup>7</sup> for Meillet, Common Italic was equally evident. But more recent scholarship, particularly in Italy, has cast considerable doubt on the unity of Italic. Since for other reasons, which will appear, I reject the notion of Italo-Celtic unity, and since the Italic question is dealt with elsewhere at this conference, I shall ignore it, and simply consider Meillet’s position as given.

With all these methodological preliminaries as a background, I propose first to examine once again the evidence adduced by Meillet to prove the existence of an Italo-Celtic unity, and to explore certain characteristic features of Common Celtic and Common Italic in order to determine whether in fact they coincide in any profound way.

Meillet has examined the Celtic-Italic isoglosses in two places: *Les dialectes indo-européens*, chap. 3 (Paris, 1908), and *Esquisse d’une histoire de la langue latine*<sup>8</sup>, chap. 3 (Paris, 1933). The earlier work gives a straight list of what is common to Celtic and Italic alone. The later version gives

---

<sup>5</sup> See L. Bloomfield, “Menomini morphophonemics,” *TCLP* 8.105–115 (1939); M. Halle, “Phonology in a generative grammar,” *Word* 18.54–72 (1962); Halle, “On the role of simplicity in linguistic descriptions,” in *Structure of language and its mathematical aspects. Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics* 12. 89–94 (1961).

<sup>6</sup> It is gratifying to be able to equate this expression with the synchronic concept of the ordered rule, classically stated by Bloomfield in his “Menomini morphophonemics” only three years after the publication of Benveniste’s *Origines*.

<sup>7</sup> As E. P. Hamp has shown, *Lochlan* 1.211 (1958), the “isogloss” between P-Celtic and Q-Celtic is structurally trivial.

in many ways a more interesting, though less clear list. As well as strictly Italo-Celtic features, it includes features that are shared with Indo-Iranian, and present "marginal" or peripheral conservations, as well as certain items of the lexicon which are common to "North-Western" Indo-European languages. We shall follow, in general, the earlier list, considering only what is peculiar to Celtic and Italic; linguistic features reflecting either peripheral conservations or a certain Western Indo-European linguistic community do not in themselves prove a specific Italo-Celtic unity, nor do they necessarily imply one. Meillet's list has been discussed and commented on many times; most relevant works are noted in note 1 above. I do not intend to repeat what has been said in detail, but only to add a few additional comments to each item, in order better to evaluate it.

The first two items on Meillet's list are the only common phonetic features: the assimilation  $p \dots k^w > k^w \dots k^w$ , and the treatment  $\circ r, \circ l > ar, al$ , differing from that of  $r, l > Lat. or, ol, Celt. ri, li$ .<sup>8</sup> The second of these may now be eliminated as a specific "Italo-Celtic" feature, after J. Kuryłowicz, *L'apophonie en indo-européen* 166 ff. (Wrocław, 1956); we have the characteristic development of an antevocalic zero-grade *TaR-o-* in all the "Southern" Indo-European languages, Celtic, Italic, Greek, and Armenian. The concept of the latter as a dialect area in Indo-European, though it in no way implies a common language, deserves further exploration; I would like to have seen it—and similar larger dialectal groupings—figure among the topics treated at this conference.

As for the assimilation  $p \dots k^w > k^w \dots k^w$ , it is well to remember that it affects only three lexical items, Lat. *quīnque, coquō, quercus*; and that, as pointed out by Hoenigswald, there were no inherited roots of the shape  $k^w \dots k^w$ . The case of *quercus* is peculiar. Meillet states that the name of the Hercynian forest *'Epkívia* indicates only that the change  $p \dots k^w > k^w \dots k^w$  is posterior to that of  $k^wu$  to  $ku$ : the resultant *\*perkūn-* (cf. Lith. *Perkūnas*) was then free to lose its *p* in Celtic, as regularly.<sup>9</sup> But *quercus* indicates that in Latin,  $p \dots k^w > k^w \dots k^w$  is prior to  $k^wu > ku$ . The relative lateness of the latter change is indicated by Umbrian *pufe* and Oscan *puf*: Lat. *ne-cubi (ubi)*, which show  $k^w > p$  also before *u*. The simplest explanation for the variance between Celtic

<sup>8</sup> W. Cowgill has suggested (*per litteras*) that "the occasional change of *-ow-* to *-aw-* in words like W *naw*, Lat. *cavus*" might be considered a shared phonologic innovation of Italic and Celtic. But I would reject this in view of the irregularity and unpredictability of the change in both languages, and the simple fact that the lexical items affected do not correspond: W *naw* but Lat. *nouem*.

<sup>9</sup> On certain problems of this group of cognates, see the brilliant article of V. V. Ivanov, "K etimologii baltijskogo i slavjanskogo nazvanij boga groma," *Vopr. slav. jaz.* 101–111 (1958).

and Italic is to assume that the assimilation is independent in each. The contexts of this assimilation in the two groups are actually not parallel. In Latin we have the substitution of *k<sup>w</sup>* for *p*, with both continuing to exist in the inventory: the consonantal “square” remains unaffected. But Celtic shows a different picture, precisely because of the “loss” of Indo-European *p*: the consonantal “square” was replaced by a “triangle” opposing *t*, *k*, *k<sup>w</sup>/p*.<sup>10</sup> It seems equally plausible to suggest that Celtic *φ* from *p* simply fell together with the new structure point *k<sup>w</sup>/p* in the environment we describe in Indo-European terms as *p . . . k<sup>w</sup>*, yielding dialectally *k<sup>w</sup> . . . k<sup>w</sup>* or *p . . . p*. This is rather similar to merging with *k* before *s* and *t*; *k* in this position represents the neutralization of the opposition *k<sup>w</sup>/p : k*, hence we can simply set up *φ > k<sup>w</sup>/p* here as well.

Besides the three Latin lexemes mentioned, there is a fourth that shows a divergent assimilation: *prope*. The collocation *prope : proximus* indicates an internal reconstruction *\*prok<sup>w</sup>*, as Ernout and Meillet point out. They suggest that the reverse assimilation *prok<sup>w</sup>- > prop-* should be attributed to the Latin nontolerance of initial *k<sup>w</sup>r-*; but we have ample evidence that this cluster was tolerated in Goidelic Celtic, cf. R. Thurneysen, *A grammar of Old Irish* 137 (Dublin, 1946), abbr. *OIGr*. *Proximus* indicates that the assimilation must be more recent—or synchronically a later rule—than the neutralization of *k<sup>w</sup>* and *k* before *s*; we have here also divergent systems, since Latin preserves *ps* distinct whereas Celtic merges *ps* with *ks* and *k<sup>w</sup>s*. In either event we have a chronological problem which can be most easily resolved by assuming that the assimilation is independent in Italic and in Celtic.

One final form which deserves to figure in the literature is the following. In Old Irish, in combinations of digits and tens (such as the numerals 11–19 and 21–29), the tens follow in the genitive. The form that functions as genitive of *deich n-* ‘ten’ (*\*dekm*) is disyllabic *dēac*, archaic *dēec*: *di rainn deac* ‘twelve parts’. This form *deac* (*c* = /g/.) cannot be related to *deich n-*, or derived from *\*dekm*. The only reasonable derivation is given both by Pedersen (*VKG* 2.133) and Thurneysen (*OIGr*. 247): *\*dwei-penk<sup>w</sup>-* ‘two fives, twice five’. Such a multiplicative counting system is doubtless Common Celtic; we have possible traces in Middle and Modern Welsh *deunaw* ‘eighteen’, literally ‘twice nine’, or Breton *trioeuc'h* ‘eighteen’, literally ‘thrice six’, as well as in the well-known vigesimal units. The preservation of the sequence *p . . . k<sup>w</sup>* in the word for ‘five’, when the second member of a compound (*\*dwei-penk<sup>w</sup>- > deac*), may be taken as the final piece of evidence for the independence of the assimilation *p . . . k<sup>w</sup> > k<sup>w</sup> . . . k<sup>w</sup>* in Celtic and Italic.

---

<sup>10</sup> Hamp, *loc. cit.*: *k<sup>w</sup>/p* realized as *k<sup>w</sup>* in Goidelic, *p* in Brittonic.

These two are the phonological developments presumed to be shared by Italic and Celtic; both must be rejected. When we set beside them the enormous differences between the two in the earliest reconstructible stages of the phonological system of each, it is difficult to imagine a unity any later than Late Indo-European itself. This situation contrasts notably with that of Baltic and Slavic, where in general a rather simple set of phonological rules operating fairly late—"palatalizations" of the velars, metatheses, monophthongizations, and so on—will generate Common Slavic forms from those of Common Baltic. For "Italo-Celtic," on the other hand, we would have to account for the unvoicing and spirantization of the "aspirates" in Italic, and their voicing and merger with the voiced unaspirated stops in Celtic; the maintenance of a consonantal square in Italic (the Oscan and Umbrian elimination of the labiovelars is surely late, as is that of Greek), and the peculiar form of the development of a triangular system in Celtic, intimately bound up with the "loss" of Indo-European *p*; the Italic preservation intact of the five-vowel system with a correlation of length, beside the Celtic rearrangement of the long vowels and diphthongs (*ē* > *ī*, *ei* > *ē*) and elimination of *ō* (> *ā* or *ū*). The sheer inefficiency of generating these two systems from anything except Indo-European itself is enough to justify rejecting an intermediate Italo-Celtic unity.

The last item in Meillet's list is a small set of lexemes common to Celtic and Italic alone: some eight items, increased by three in the *Esquisse*. It should be pointed out immediately that Meillet himself was able to give a far longer list of inherited lexemes occurring uniquely in Greek and Armenian—some twenty-five items—without for that postulating a Greco-Armenian unity.<sup>11</sup> As is well known in Indo-European studies (and is deserving of wider recognition among American linguists), simple and unstructured lexical correspondences are the weakest possible evidence for genetic classification or subgrouping.<sup>12</sup>

Not all the Italo-Celtic lexemes adduced by Meillet are exact cognates, e.g., *īmus* : *īsel*, *pectus* : *ucht*, *terra* : *tīr*, *ille* / *ollo-*, *ul-trā* : *t-all*. Of those that are, the only ones of structural significance (because they are part of a system!) are the preverbs and prepositions *dē* : *dī-*, *co(m)-* : *co(m)-*, and the latter, as Cowgill points out, must be also connected with Germanic *ga-*. To these I would also add *re(d)-* : *fri(th)-* < *wrl<sup>13</sup>* (: Lat. *vertō*). These three preverbal forms testify to the close relationship of Italic and Celtic; their evidence is similar to that of Lat. *ad* : OIr. *ad-* : Goth. *at*, showing somewhat wider affinities. But they can in no

<sup>11</sup> *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*<sup>2</sup> (Vienna, 1936).

<sup>12</sup> Cf. K. V. Teeter, *Proc. IX Int. Cong. of Ling.* 771-777 (The Hague, 1964).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Hamp, *Bull. of the Board of Celt. Stud.* 15.124-125 (1953).

sense be taken as indicating a unity; we need only juxtapose the total system of preverbs and prepositions in the two language groups to see that they neither "recover" each other, nor "complete" each other.<sup>14</sup> To look from the Celtic side, there is no Latin or Italic cognate of *ar* 'before' (incl. *ir-* : *περι*), *aith-* (semantically = *re(d)-*), *co* 'to', *do* 'to', *tar* 'after', *ni-* 'down', *oc* 'at', *oss-* 'up, off', *tar* 'across', *to-* 'to', *tret* 'through'. From the Latin side, there is no Celtic cognate of *ab*, *ante*, *apud*, *circum*, *ob*, *per*, *prae*. Certain of these could perhaps be reduced, for example, *tar* : *trāns* as ultimate cognates; but such equations could be balanced by, for instance, the absence of *s-* in Ir. *fo, for* < \**upo*, \**upor* : *sub, super*. Anyone who takes the trouble to set up for himself the system of preverbs and/or prepositions in the two languages, even in rigorously excluding late developments in each, will be convinced that in no way can the two be reduced to a unity.

The composite suffix *-tiō/n-*, item seven on Meillet's first list, has already been discussed above. In the later list, Meillet points also to the suffix *-tū-t-*, which is found principally in Italic, Celtic, and Germanic. Such forms doubtless are evidence for early contact among the three groups, but they are clearly distinct; *-tūt-* is masculine in Celtic, but feminine in Latin.

The sixth item on Meillet's list is the superlative suffix \*-*samo-* (\*-*samo-*): the type *maximus* (*markumus*), Osc. *nessimas* 'proximac', OIr. *nessam*, W *nesaf* 'nearcst'. In such forms as these, it is clear that the suffixes are identical. But it is important to note that the identity between the two is valid only for the athematic adjectives: \**mag-samo-*, etc. For the thematic type we have different forms: Lat. \*-*is-samo-* > *-issimus*, or \*-(*r)o-samo- > -errimus* (type *miserrimus*), but Celt. \*-*is-samo-* (OW *hinhaf*, OIr. *sinem* 'oldest' < \**senisamo-* to \**seno-*, cf. Gaul. *Oὐξισάμη*). Add to this the fact that Umbrian shows no *-s-* in *nurime* 'newest' (IIa 26). The two (-*isamo-* and *-samo-*) are not the same; they could be derived from the same form only by ignoring the *-is-* of Lat. *-is-simo-*, and by assuming that the Celtic form has been generalized from the suffixation of *-samo-* to *i*-stem adjectives, like Lat. *ācerrimus* \**ācri-samo-*. But considering the numerical preponderance of *o*-stem adjectives in Celtic, together with the fact that the adjective is one place where the thematic nominal type is most ancient in Indo-European, an influence of *i*-stem adjectives in Celtic is not readily admissible. We

---

<sup>14</sup> In this way I would answer the point—in itself methodologically significant and worth retaining—of the late J. Vendryes, who stated (*Revue celtique* 42.380 [1925]): "Le résultat de la comparaison n'est pas que les langues italiques et celtes se recouvrent, mais que sur presque chaque point de leur structure elles se complètent."

must regard the two groups, Italic and Celtic, as closely similar, in that they alone share the *-s-*; but the formation cannot be completely reduced to a unity.

The difference of the total system in each group of the superlative, and of the comparison adjective in general, also speaks strongly against a unity. In Celtic, *-samo-* is the unique superlative formation, whereas in Latin we have forms such as *imus*, *summus*, *infimus*, *optimus*, *ultimus*, with suffixes *\*-mo-*, *\*-amo-*, *\*-tamo-*, all of which have other well-known Indo-European affinities. In Celtic the only comparable forms are found in the ordinals in *-am-(+ -eto-)*, e.g., Gaul. *sextametos*, *decametos*, OIr. *sechmad*, *dechmad*, cf. Lat. *septimus*, *decimus*, Skt. *saptamá-*, *daśamá-*. The relation of these to the superlative formations deserves fuller exploration.

We may add to all this the fact that the Celtic comparison of the adjective includes a fourth term, the equative ('as good as'). The formation is of obscure origin and different in the two branches of Celtic, but the category itself is surely old. Thurneysen (*OIGr.* 237) conjectures that the two are related: MW *-het* < *\*-iset* . . . , with the *\*-t-* appearing in Ir. *-ith(ir)*. But it is difficult to account for the suffixation of *-ir*; the final palatalized *-r* of *móir* 'as great as' (*mór* 'great'), *lir* 'as many as' (*il* 'many') is not easily segmented out. On the other hand, the Brittonic *-het* can be analyzed as *\*is + eto-*, with a suffix curiously paralleling the superlative *\*-is + amo-*; just as *-amo-* is an ordinal suffix in *septimus*, *saptamá-*, so *-eto-* is an ordinal suffix in Ir. *cóiced* 'fifth'. The productive Irish ordinal suffix *-mad*, which ultimately prevails throughout (Mod. Ir. *cúigmhadh /ku:g'u:/*, etc.), simply combines the two, *\*-am(o)* + *eto-*.

There are notable syntactic differences as well: in Celtic the equative, comparative, and superlative are uninflected forms and are syntactically construed only as predicate nominatives. In the original version of the present paper, I suggested that this obligatory predicate nominative construction represented a notable archaism; I have since discovered that this view was anticipated by Meillet in an article in the *Mélanges J. Loth* 122–125 (Paris, 1927). The question merits a fresh examination, which I believe would uphold the essential correctness of Meillet's and my view; but it cannot be attempted here. We have, in any event, simply on the immediate evidence of the data, a rather deep divergence between Italic and Celtic.

Meillet's third item is the genitive singular of *o*-stems in *-i*, which belongs to the plane of nominal declension. Between the publication of Meillet's first and second lists came Wackernagel's comparison of the Indo-Iranian type *mihunī-kr-* 'to pair', Av. *dāityō-aēsmi buyā* 'may you

become *dāityō-aēsma-* ('with religiously suitable firewood')<sup>15</sup> which provided an attestation of a similar formation outside of Italic and Celtic. This equation has recently been denied, in a long study by A. Bloch in *KZ* 76.182–242 (1959–1960), which would perhaps throw the morpheme *-ī* back into the sphere of Italic and Celtic once more. The formation is, however, also attested in the Illyrian Messapic. The peculiarity of its implementation in Messapic, gen. sg. *-ī* to *yo*-stems (nom. sg. *-es*) but gen. sg. *-aī* to *o*-stems (nom. sg. *-as*), would militate against its having been borrowed from Italic on the soil of Italy, particularly since the nearest adjacent Italic languages do not themselves show a genitive in *-ī* (Oscan *-eis* < *i*-stems).

The integration into the paradigm of the *o*- and *yo*-stems of a form in *-ī* in the function of a genitive singular may be a common "South-western" feature of Italic, Celtic, and Messapic. But we know that a single dialectal group in Indo-European may show divergent forms of the *o*-stem genitive, as in OPruss. *deiwas* (< \*-osō) : Lith. *diēvo* (< abl. \*-ōd). The closest dialect to Latin within Italic, Faliscan, shows a gen. sg. *-osio* in the earliest texts (*eko kaisiosio*, Vetter 245);<sup>16</sup> the same form is in my opinion preserved in the Latin pronominal genitives of the type *eiiu-s*, *quoiiu-s* (*cuius*), as well as in OIr. *a* (leniting) 'his', MW *eidd-aw* < \**esyō*. Under these circumstances it would appear that the implementation of *-ī* was not entirely parallel, nor equally general, in Italic and Celtic; we may note that in older Latin the genitive of *yo*-stems was *-ī* (which perhaps agrees with Skt. *-ī* to both *-a-* and *-ya-*), whereas OIr. *-i* requires \**-iī* (*-iyī*) to *yo*-stems.

The great variation among the Indo-European languages in the form of the *o*-stem genitives would indicate that there simply was no Indo-European form; this is supported by the identity of nom. *-aš* and gen. *-aš* in Hittite, and by the absence of a genitive case in Luvian, where the relational *-ašša/i-* functionally parallels the Old Latin type *erīlis filius*, or Old Russian *knjaži dvorū*.<sup>17</sup> This would suggest that the genitive singular of *o*-stems is one place in the system where we should expect innovations to occur. It is not surprising that Italic and Celtic should settle on a morpheme *-ī* which clearly existed in Indo-European somewhere in the penumbra between an inflectional and a derivational form (I find it hard to separate the "feminine" *-ī*). But considering that Italic also tried out *-osyo*, and that *-ī* recurs as genitive singular also in Mes-

<sup>15</sup> *Mélanges Saussure* 125–152 (Paris, 1908).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. J. Safarewicz, *Eos* 47.101–105 (1954), who defends the "prisca latinitas" of *Metioeo Fufetioeo* in Ennius (*Ann.* 126).

<sup>17</sup> I hope to examine elsewhere the formal and particularly syntactic evidence for the late and secondary character of the genitive in general in Indo-European.

sapic, we must conclude that the community of *-i* in Italic and Celtic is attributable to early contact, rather than to an original unity.

Meillet's fourth item is the deponent and passive desinences characterized by *-r(-)*, e.g., OIr. *-berar* 'fertur', Umbr. *ferar* 'feratur' (but OIr. *-berthar* 'feratur', with *-t-*). With the discovery of Tocharian and Hittite it became clear to Meillet and others that these endings represented the conservation of very archaic forms, which had been replaced in varying fashions in other Indo-European languages. For Meillet this was a classic case of "marginal" preservation: "Il s'agit donc d'un type ancien conservé dans les langues périphériques mais éliminé dans la partie centrale du domaine." (*Esquisse*<sup>3</sup> 24.) To explain the *r* endings as "marginal" implies that they are ab initio incompatible with the desinential system reconstructed on the basis of Greek and Indo-Iranian. But this view is by no means necessarily correct. In a brief but suggestive article,<sup>18</sup> Kuryłowicz has sketched how we may derive both the systems of Greek and Indo-Iranian on the one hand, and those of Italic, Celtic, and Hittite on the other, from the *same* original system. While some of the data remain to be accounted for, and while certain of Kuryłowicz's morphological transformations are not altogether satisfactory, I am convinced that he has pointed out the right direction for future productive research on the problem.

For the specific relation of the Italic and Celtic forms, it is sufficient to reproduce Kuryłowicz's remarks (*loc. cit.*, 134): 'It is scarcely necessary to observe that the mediopassive endings have been transformed independently in Keltic and in Italic.' To attempt to survey the whole development of the desinential system in each language group would involve a separate study, indeed a monograph; no such survey can be contemplated here. I point out that in view of the disparity in the other and more fundamental persons of the paradigm, the identity of the 1st sg. Lat. ind. *sequor*, subj. *sequear* : OIr. ind. *-moiniur*,<sup>19</sup> subj. *-menar*, is far more likely to reflect parallel and independent development than to be a common inheritance. It should further be noted that in Irish as in other Indo-European languages the most archaic forms of the indicative, reflecting earlier "injunctive" forms, are found in the Old Irish imperative (outside the 2nd sg. ind.), rather than in the Old Irish indicative.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>18</sup> *Hibernica*. III. The deponential (mediopassive) endings, *Biul. Polsk. Tow. Jęz.* 20.131–136 (1961).

<sup>19</sup> Ir. *sechur*, cited by Meillet, *Esquisse*<sup>3</sup> 23, as an exact cognate of *sequor*, does not exist. Since it is a weak *i*-verb in the earliest Irish, we should expect in any case 1st sg. \**se(i)chiur*.

<sup>20</sup> For the demonstration, see pp. 41–49 of my study, "Preliminaries to a historical and comparative analysis of the syntax of the Old Irish verb," *Celtica* 6.1–49 (1963). The same has been arrived at independently by W. Meid, in his (un-

For this reason it is a priori more likely that the earliest Celtic medio-passive personal endings of which we have sure information are 1st sg. *-ur*, 2nd sg. *-the*, 3rd sg. *-eth*, 1st pl. *-emmar*, 3rd pl. *-tar* (*OIGr.* 373). The 2nd pl. is, in classical Old Irish, identical with the active form *-id(ih)*, and Meillet regards this as significant, recalling the secondary origin of Lat. *-minī* (and archaic ipv. *-minō*). But as D. A. Binchy has pointed out privately, in archaic Old Irish texts we have good evidence for the 2nd pl. ipv. *fomna(i)s* ‘beware!’ to *fo-moinethar*,<sup>21</sup> hence an old ending *-ais*. One is tempted to compare Gk. *-(e)σθε*, though that has been taken as secondary.

Before passing on to Meillet’s fifth item and the last in my ordering, namely the mood and tense signs *-ā-*, *-s-*, and *-b-*, it is important to add a brief note on the participles and the formation of the feminine. In his celebrated article, “Essai de chronologie des langues indo-européennes,” *BSL* 32.1–28 (1931), Meillet presented a number of arguments for the late character of the feminine gender. His theory has been much discussed, but this is clearly not the place to review the whole issue; I would only call attention to one point. Meillet notes the absence of a feminine in Latin *i*-stem adjectives (type *fortis*), regarding it as ancient, and notes that Celtic agrees (type *maith* ‘good’). He further calls attention to the absence of a feminine in the Latin participles, and the type *ferēns* is also singled out as an archaic survival in *Esquisse*<sup>22</sup> 19. Whatever view one may take of the Latin forms—a *\*bher(e)ntī* would yield *ferēns* in Latin, cf. Skt. *naptī* : *neptis* and *mēns* < *\*mentis*—it should be made clear that Celtic shows unmistakable traces of distinct masculine and feminine participial forms. These are all the more probative for the fact that the participle as a deveritative grammatical category was given up in the Celtic languages at a relatively early date. We need only point to OIr. *carae* m. ‘friend’ < *\*karant-s* ( : *caraid* ‘loves’), and *birit* f. ‘sow’ < *\*bher(e)ntī* ( : *berid* ‘bears’) or m. *cano*, gen. *canat* ‘poet of the fourth degree’ beside f. *canait* ‘Sängerin’, both from the verbal root *can-* ‘sing’. The feminines in *-(e)ntī* must be old, on the evidence of the equation *Brigit* (an ancient Irish pagan goddess, cf. Cormac’s Glossary §150) : Vedic *bṛhatī* ‘the exalted one’ (recurring as a divine epithet, e.g., of Usas). The sole counterexamples one might cite are the adjective *tee*, *té* (n. pl. *teit*) ‘hot’ < *\*tep-ent-*, which has the same form for all genders,

published) *Habilitationsschrift*; cf. his articles in *ZCP* 29.155–179 (1962), *Orbis* 10.434–438 (1961).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *ZCP* 11.97 §56 (Audacht Moraind, version B), and see the RIA Dictionary s.v. *fo-moinethar*.

<sup>22</sup> For a fuller collection and analysis, see Vendryes, *Corolla Linguistica* (Festschrift Sommer) 229–234 (Wiesbaden, 1955); J. Pokorny, *Münch. Stud. zur Sprachwiss.* 15.5 ff. (1959).

or the feminine gender of *doe* (acc. sg. *doit*) ‘upper arm’. But there is no indication that *doe* was ever a participle, and since *tee* is the only adjective stem in \*-nt-, its inflexion would naturally tend to be assimilated to that of other consonantal stem adjectives, which do not differentiate the feminine.

We may conclude with the examination of the verbal system proper. Meillet’s evidence for Italo-Celtic inheritances includes the subjunctives in -ā- and in -s- (archaic *aduenat*, *faxō*) and in the future in -b-. In his final statement on Italo-Celtic (*Esquisse*<sup>23</sup>), Meillet no longer maintained the equation of the Latin *b*-future with the Old Irish *f*-future; it is not mentioned. Rather, as he clearly states (p. 30), the *b*-future is a purely Latin development, built on the imperfect in -bā-, which is confined to Italic. In rejecting the equation -b- : -f- Meillet followed Thurneysen (cf. *OIGr.* 398), and in this view he was eminently justified. “Les rapprochements valent seulement dans la mesure où ils sont soumis à des règles strictes”;<sup>24</sup> Old Irish -f- cannot be derived from IE \*bh, hence this equation, however tempting,<sup>24</sup> must be abandoned once and for all. The Irish *f*-future remains an enigma, but it has no connections with Italic, and any explanation for it must come from within Celtic, specifically Goidelic.

The Old Irish subjunctive in -s-, preserved residually in Early Welsh, is not a Common Celtic subjunctive in -s-; it is a Common Celtic aorist indicative in -s-. I have demonstrated this at some length in my *Indo-European origins of the Celtic verb. I. The sigmatic aorist* (Dublin, 1962), and the argumentation need not be reiterated here. The distribution of the s-subjunctive in Celtic, and its athematic character, preclude comparison with the sporadic Latin type *faxō*. I do not wish to go into the complex question of the origin of this type in Latin, which demands another monograph. Suffice it to say that the coexistence of a subjunctive in -s- and a subjunctive in -ā- in Celtic and Latin (where the “subjunctive” in -s- appears as a future) is not common patrimony; it is a historical accident.

The archaic character of the subjunctive in -ā-, as well as its original optative function, have been discussed above. It is one of the few forms that do testify to the early close relation of Italic and Celtic. But this should not conceal from us the fact that the implementation of this modal morpheme -ā- in the two systems is not the same. In Celtic, -ā- was originally suffixed to all verbs, strong as well as weak; in the weak *i*-verbs the type *do-lugi* ‘forgives, remits’ < \**log-yo/č-* (“iterative-causative” to \**legh-*) with subj. (2nd pl.) *do-logaid* < \**log-ā-* is surely more ancient

<sup>23</sup> Meillet, *La méthode comparative en linguistique historique* 41 (Oslo, 1925).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. A. Sommerfelt, *MSL* 22.230–233 (1921).

than the corresponding Latin type *mon-e-ā-s*. Similarly, in Celtic but not Italie, the weak verbs in stem vowel -ā- also form a subjunctive in -ā-, with the result that indicative and subjunctive are identical; we have a very old vowel-dropping rule, -ā- + -ā- > -ā-. For Common Celtie we can posit two forms alone on the modal plane: an “optative” in -ā-, and a “desiderative” with reduplication and a suffix -s- (OIr. *s*-future),<sup>25</sup> whieh was confined to nonderived (“strong”) verbs. The relation of these to each other in Common Celtic is unclear, but we do know that they could not have originally complemented each other in the omnibus function of a “subjunctive.” While the form in -ā- recurs in Italie, that with reduplication and -s- has a correspondent only in the Indo-Iranian desiderative.

The total pieture of the modal category in Italic is entirely different. Beside the old optative in -ā-, Latin shows the old optative in -yē/ī- (*siēs/simus, edim, uelim*). In Latin it was doubtless more productive at an earlier period, since it was incorporated into the innovated perfect subjunctive \*-is-ī- (*fēcerim*). But for this optative formation we have no analogue in Celtic whatsoever. The imperfect subjunctive in \*-sē- is common to Latin and the Italie dialects (*essēs, fusid*); no comparable form exists in Celtie. The morpheme -sē- is perhaps an Italie creation, but it was not made up out of whole cloth. We may assume the -s- of -sē- is the same as that followed by -e/o- in *faxō*, which leaves us with a mark -ē-.

This -ē- recurs elsewhere in Latin as a modal or tense morpheme: in the future of primary verbs (*ferēs, faciēs*), whieh was doubtless earlier a mood, and in the present subjunctive of ā-verbs (*laudem, -ēs*). The manuals separate these two, and derive neither from an original -ē-; the future is equated with Greek and Vedic long-vowel subjunctive, *ferēs* : φέρης : *bharās(i)*, and the subjunctive is derived from an athematic optative suffix, \**laudā-yē-m*. There are serious difficulties with both these explanations. The long vowel subjunctive shows apophony ē/ō in the paradigm, repeating the distribution of *e/o*. It is very difficult to explain why Latin should have generalized -ē- in all the persons, including the first singular; the form replaced by subj. -am was -em (archaie *sinem, faciem*), probably to differentiate the form from the impf. subj. -em, and not a putative -ō identical with the indicative. The optative morpheme was apophonie -yē/ī-, and it is equally difficult to explain why in the putative type -ā-yē- Latin should have generalized the full grade -yē- throughout the paradigm (*laudēmus, -ētis, -ent*), when the undeniable trend in the language was to generalize the weak grade -ī-, as in *edim*,

<sup>25</sup> Unless the *s*-future is a late reduplicated form of the *s*-subjunctive, which is perhaps less likely.

*welim.*<sup>26</sup> For these reasons I prefer to take both formations at face value; they show an Italic modal morpheme *-ē-*. It is this *-ē-* which was suffixed to *-s-* in the Italic period, to form the new modal suffix *-sē-*. It is worth noting that beside the modal signs *-ā-*, *-ē-*, *-sē-*, we have one form in Latin showing that a parallel *-sā-* was formed: the adverb *dumtaxat < dum . . . tag-sā-t* 'until it touch' (the earlier 'tmesis' is preserved in *CIL 1<sup>2</sup>.582*).<sup>27</sup> The modal sign *-ē-* is ancient in Italic; but no trace of it is found in Celtie. It is tempting to relate the Latin modal system with *-ā-* and *-ē-* to the Balto-Slavie infinitive and preterit stems in *-ā-* and *-ē-* (Lith. extended pret. *-ējo-*), which C. S. Stang derives from aorists.<sup>28</sup> But this is put forth simply as a hypothesis.

In the total system of the finite verb in Latin, we have a fundamental opposition of *infectum* and *perfectum*, a present, past, and future of each in the indicative, and a present-future and past in the subjunctive—ten functional structure points in all. Leaving aside the present of *infectum* and *perfectum* (i.e., the perfect), which show characteristic retentions of a variety of Indo-European types, the forms present the following configuration:

<i>Indicative</i>		<i>Subjunctive</i>	
<i>Infectum</i>	<i>Perfectum</i>	<i>Infectum</i>	<i>Perfectum</i>
fut.	<i>-be-, -ē-, -(s)e-</i>	<i>-is-e-</i>	
pres.			<i>-ā-, -ē-, -ī-</i>
past	<i>-bā-</i>	<i>-is-ā-</i>	<i>-sē-</i>
			<i>-is-sē-</i>

Of all the rich variety of forms here, one and one alone is also found in Celtie: *-ā-*. This organization of the verbal system is Common Italic, but it bears little or no resemblance to that of Common Celtie, which looks far more like the organization of the verbal system of Common Greek.<sup>29</sup>

Under these circumstances of both formal and functional disparity, we are led to the unavoidable conclusion that Italo-Celtic unity is a myth. The only common language from which both Italic and Celtie can be

<sup>26</sup> The tendency to generalize the weak grade in cases of paradigmatic apophony is itself a noteworthy common feature of Celtie and Italic, as is the morphophonemic suppression of the reduplicating syllable in the composition of verb and preverb.

<sup>27</sup> The formal identity of this *\*-sā-* with the *\*-sā-* underlying the Brittonic subjunctive is a coincidence. Cf. my *Indo-European origins of the Celtic verb* 145–156.

<sup>28</sup> *Das slavische und baltische Verbum* 188 ff. (Oslo, 1942).

<sup>29</sup> Cf. *IE origins of the Celtic verb* 107–110.

derived is Indo-European itself; the only single grammar that could account for each would be the grammar of Indo-European. For this reason I must reject the final part of Meillet's statement (*Esquisse*<sup>3</sup> 27) that "les colons qui ont porté en Occident les parlers sur lesquels reposent l'italique et le celtique avaient sensiblement la même langue." The dictum itself, however, is worthy of retention; if we delete the last five words, we have an elegant linguistic statement of the nature of the historical transmission of common languages. Meillet himself stated in 1925 that "la période de communauté italo-celtique rend peu de services";<sup>30</sup> as in other aspects of both historical and descriptive linguistics, want of utility is *prima facie* evidence of want of verisimilitude.

Meillet has spoken at several places of an "Indo-European nation," an "Italo-Celtic nation," and an "Italic nation." The precise value of the term *nation* as used by Meillet is uncertain; he himself saw clearly that Indo-European society was tribal and familiar, and "ne comportait pas d'<sup>e</sup> pouvoir central" (*La méthode comparative* 19). In fact, it is difficult to imagine what an "Italo-Celtic nation" would consist of, and what would justify the use of the term except the hypothesis of a single language. Ireland was Irish-speaking for millennia before anybody could be accused of "bringing starvation to the whole Irish nation." The very concept of "nation" was foreign to Celtic-speaking cultures down almost to the present day, and the Celts never developed the notion of a polity such as is familiar from Greek and Roman tradition. As for the Romans, the development of a nation is a process that took place in historical times, and certainly on the soil of Italy itself. The picture to be gathered from extralinguistic data of the migrations of "Italic" speakers into Italy would seem to preclude any consideration of an "Italic nation" and, a fortiori, an "Italo-Celtic nation."<sup>31</sup>

In ancient Ireland as depicted in the Irish Law Tracts, which furnish the clearest and most direct picture of what Indo-European tribal society must have been like,<sup>32</sup> the highest social unit was the *túath*, an amorphous collection of joint families (Ir. *fine*) "ruled" by a 'petty-king' (Ir. *rí*). Any putative larger social entity (such as would seem to be required by Meillet's "nation") was in ancient Ireland purely a personal relation (generally one of obligation) between the 'petty-king' and an 'over-king' (Ir. *ruiri* < *ro* + *rí*), who might himself be under a personal obligation to a 'king of over-kings' (Ir. *rí ruirech*). But the 'over-king' had no rights of "government" or administration or levy over the *túath* of the *rí*, nor did the 'king of over-kings' over the *túath* of the 'over-king'.

<sup>30</sup> *La méthode comparative* 17.

<sup>31</sup> See especially Pulgram, *The Tongues of Italy* 229n.

<sup>32</sup> I must acknowledge my profound indebtedness to D. A. Binchy's stimulating Harvard lectures on the Institutions of the Insular Celts.

The ‘king of over-kings’ was, in Ireland, the king of a province (e.g., Ulster, Connacht); but the “province” was purely a geographical area of Ireland, not a political unit, as is shown by its Irish name *coiced*, lit. ‘fifth’.

That for some Italic speakers the highest social unit was likewise at one time the \**toutā* may be inferred from Osc. *touto* ‘populus’, Umbr. *tota* ‘civitas’. But this is a general feature of Western Indo-European languages, as shown by Goth. *þiuda* and especially *þiudans* ‘king’ (with Gmc. \*-ono-). The ‘king’ is literally ‘he in whom the *þiuda* is realized’;<sup>33</sup> it is the king who personally represents, symbolizes, the tribe, both in its relations with the outside world (other tribes) and with the supernatural.

The linguistic expression in Indo-European for this relation is the suffix \*-no- (or its dialectal replacement, as in Germanic): Goth. *þiuda* → *þiudans*.<sup>34</sup> The same process is found in Slavic: Serbo-Croatian *župa* ‘territorial or administrative unit’ → *župân* ‘ruler of a *župa*, he who represents the *župa*'.<sup>35</sup> For Celtic, following a brilliant suggestion of Binchy, we may compare the name of a powerful Northern British tribe *Brigantes* → \**brigantînos* ‘he who represents the Brigantes’,<sup>36</sup> the etymon of MW *brêen hin* ‘king’ which ousted the older *rhi* < \**rēg-s*. Finally the formation recurs, as is well known, in Lat. *tribûnus* (with lengthened stem vowel before secondary suffix) ‘he who represents, who is the *tribus*’.

The word *tribus* is worthy of further consideration. It is found also in Umbrian, always in asyndetic conjunction with *tota-*; it is applied by the Iguvini to themselves, as in, for example, III 24–25 *tutape(r) iiuvina trefiper iiuvina* ‘pro civitate Iguvina, pro tribu Iguvina’ (Vetter), as well as to the hostile inhabitants of Tadinum, twenty kilometers away, as in, for example, VIb 53–54 *pis est totar tarsinater trifor tarsinater quisquis est*

<sup>33</sup> To utilize Benveniste’s analysis of the parallel suffix \*-to-, *Noms d’agent et noms d’action en indo-européen* 167–168 (Paris, 1948).

<sup>34</sup> First pointed out by F. de Saussure; see the *Cours*, Pt. V, chap. 4; and cf. R. Godel, *Les sources manuscrites du Cours* 111 (Geneva, 1957). For a full treatment see Meid, *Beitr. zur Namenforschung* 8.72–108, 113–126 (1957).

<sup>35</sup> Slav. *župan* is evidently in ablaut with the title OCz. *hpan*, Pol. *pan*, v. Vasmer, *Russ. etym. Wb.* s.v. *župa*, *župan*, *pan*. But the connection of Skt. *gopâ-* seems farfetched. It should be noted that the Slavic title *župan* was sociopolitically significant enough in prehistoric times to be borrowed into Turke; it is attested in the form ΖΩΑΠΑΝ, ΖΟΑΠΑΝ in the ninth-century Proto-Bulgar inscription of the Treasure of Nagy-Szent-Milkós, before our earliest documentation in Slavic itself. See O. Pritsak, *Die bulgarische Fürstenliste und die Sprache der Protobulgaren* (*Urol-Altaische Bibliothek* I) 85–90 (Wiesbaden, 1955).

<sup>36</sup> Binchy would define him rather as ‘he who incarnates, *is* the goddess *Brigantî*’. Either interpretation is possible; from the Indo-European point of view the relation was identical, cf. Lith. *Perkūnas* ‘(the god) who incarnates the sacred oak’.

civitatis Tadinatis, tribus Tadinatis'. According to Whatmough,<sup>37</sup> such passages "imply a territorial division into tribes (*trifū*) as well as the larger unit of the city (*tota*)."<sup>38</sup> It is difficult, however, to account for the consistent singular *trifū*, if the *tota* were the larger unit and comprised a number of *trifū*. The difficulty becomes even clearer if we transpose the passage to Rome: *pro civitate Romana* parallels *tutaper iiuvina*, but a *pro tribu Romana* would not make sense. Furthermore, in III 23–25 we would seem to have an ascending order: *fratrusper atiieries, ahtisper eikvasatis, tutape(r) iiuvina, trefiper iiuvina* 'pro fratribus Atiediis, pro actis (= *vītīs*) collegialibus (?)',<sup>39</sup> *pro civitate Iguvina, pro — Iguvina*'. Umbrian *trifū* in these passages makes far better sense if we translate it as *populus*, or better as Irish *túath*; it is the highest Umbrian sociopolitical (as well as geographical) unit. Whatmough invokes Livy (31.2.6.) *per Umbriam, qua tribum Sapiniam vocant*, as evidence for the tribe being a territorial division of the city. But the passage makes better sense if *tribus* denotes precisely the territory of a petty "kingdom," in short a *túath*. In this respect *trifū* is the semantic replacement of the inherited Italic *\*toutā*. The latter has been specialized in the strictly local acceptation 'city', as is clear from the locative with postposition VIa 26 *toteme iouine* 'in civitate Iguvina'. In Oscan, however, *touto* retained the meaning of 'populus', and it is surely no accident that no form of *trifū*- is found in Oscan or closely related dialects.

In Latin, it is the existence of the derivative *tribū-nus*, 'he who represents the *tribus*', which demonstrates that the same replacement of the Italic sociopolitical unit *\*toutā* by *tribus* occurred as in Umbrian. It is this fact that explains the complete absence from native Latin of the Western Indo-European word *\*teutā*.<sup>40</sup> Now such a replacement of linguistic terms implies that an earlier social institution, the *\*toutā*, was replaced by a newer social institution, the *tribus*; and commonly such replacements of institutions are brought about by borrowings from, or the imposition of, a dominant foreign culture. The geographical position of this innovation in Italy, in Latin and in Umbrian, would immediately

<sup>37</sup> *The Foundations of Roman Italy* 200.

<sup>38</sup> So, most recently, with some hesitation, A. Ernout, *Le dialecte ombrien* 107, 117 (Paris, 1961), following Vetter for *ahtis*, Buck for *eikvasatis*.

<sup>39</sup> The adjective *tōtus* is a dialect borrowing; on its semantic history see now Szemerényi, *Fachtagung für idg. u. allgem. Spr. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 15 [1962])* 195–198, though his interpretation is not entirely satisfactory. Note, however, that Hitt. *tuzzi-* must be excluded from this group, as shown by Benveniste, *Hittite et indo-européen* 122–124 (Paris, 1962). I still insist that the term is Western Indo-European, despite Pers. *toda*, Sogd. *twšk* 'mass, crowd'; the latter are not sociologically significant.

suggest the neighboring Etruscan as the source, and the Etruscan political dominance in the two areas is well known.<sup>40</sup>

Evidence for the Etruscan connections of *tribus* has been shown by C. O. Thulin;<sup>41</sup> it is apparent in the names of the three oldest *tribūs* of Rome, *Ramnes Luceres Tities*, though their tripartition and the social symbolism they reflect in Roman legend is probably an Indo-European inheritance, as G. Dumézil has convincingly shown.<sup>42</sup>

The Indo-European etymology for *tribus* is given by Walde-Hofmann as *tri-* + *bhū-*, ‘vermutlich ursprgl. “Drittel”’; Ernout and Meillet qualify this as a “simple supposition,” and the linguistic analysis is all against it. In the first place, in no Indo-European language are ordinals or fractions compounded with the verb *\*bhū-*, and it is not easy to imagine what the function of such a verb in the compound would be. In the second place, a root form, *\*-bhus*, with gen. sg. *-bhous* (Umb. *trifor* = Lat. *tribūs*), as the second member of a compound, is otherwise unknown in Italic, or for that matter anywhere else in Indo-European. Forms such as Rig-Vedic *śam-bhú-*, *vi-bhú*, *maya-bhú-*, are found mostly in nom. and acc. sg. (and never in gen. sg.), and are in origin clearly shortened forms of the corresponding cases of *śam-bhū-*, *vi-bhū*, *maya-bhū-*. To assert that Italic underwent the same development, purely on the evidence of the single form *tribus*, would be methodologically unjustified. And finally, the real impetus<sup>43</sup> toward the segmentation *tri-bhu-* goes back only to a typical etymology of Varro, *L.L.* 5.55: *ager Romanus primum divisus in partis tris, a quo tribus appellata Titienium, Ramnium, Lucerum*, i.e., the three oldest tribes of Rome. That there was an original geographical division in Rome under the Etruscans, into three *tribus*, is perhaps possible, and this situation would lend itself to reinterpretation on another level in terms of a tripartite social ideology. But in Umbrian there is no indication at all of a connection between *trifū* and ‘three’; it is always *the* *tribus* (= *populus*) Iguvina, Tadina. The specifically three ancient tribes of Rome may be equally well, if not better, taken as purely symbolic legend; the four urban tribes at the time of Servius Tullius (Livy 1.43.13), and the sixteen original rural tribes, are probably closer to the truth.

If a native Italic compound *\*tri-bhu-* thus appears unlikely in the extreme, then we must reject an Indo-European etymology for *tribus*,

<sup>40</sup> For Umbrian, cf. Whatmough, *op. cit.* 206.

<sup>41</sup> *Die Etruscsische Disciplin. III. Die Ritualbücher 48–49 (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift 1909.1).*

<sup>42</sup> Cf. *Jupiter Mars Quirinus IV*, 113–170 (Paris, 1948); *L'héritage indo-européen à Rome* 184–234 (Paris, 1949); *Rituels indo-européens à Rome* 53 (Paris, 1954).

<sup>43</sup> The Δωρικές τριχήνες (τ 177) is probably mere coincidence.

*trifū*; a root form \**tribhu-* would be impossible in Indo-European (*t . . . bh*). On the basis of their geographical distribution in Italy, in the sphere of Etruscan political dominance only, and on the evidence of other associations of *tribus* with Etruscan in Roman tradition, I would suggest that Latin *tribus* and Umbrian *trifū* are both loanwords from Etruscan.<sup>44</sup>

The original “Italic” sociopolitical structure may be conjectured to have been quite similar to that of Ireland: an amorphous collection of *triatha*, each “ruled,” or represented by, a ‘petty-king’ (*rī*). The system was nowhere preserved intact; in Oscan territories the *touto* remained the political unit, but the petty-king was replaced by the administrative and judicial office of the *meddix tuticus* (Osc. *meddix tūvtiks*). In this change we may see the development of a native South Italic form of democracy,<sup>45</sup> but it is well to remember that the *meddix tuticus*, invested with a more modern concept of public authority, doubtless wielded far more administrative rule and power than his Italic ancestor or Celtic congener, the *rī tuaithe*, ever did.

In Umbria and in Rome the old Italic unit of the *\*toutā* was replaced, under Etruscan influence or direction, by a new geographical administrative unit, the *tribus*. The memory of this organizational innovation was preserved in Roman tradition about the king Servius Tullius: *conditor omnis in civitate discriminis ordinumque* (Livy 1.42.4); *quadrifariam enim urbe divisa regionibus collibusque, qui habitabantur, partes eas tribus appellavit* (1.43.13). In Rome, the foreign origin of *tribus* did not prevent the creation of the term *tribūnus*; though *tribus* is a borrowed word for a borrowed institution, the structural relation between *tribus* and *tribūnus* ‘he who represents the *tribus*’, is Indo-European both in form and in function.

The *tribūnus* was thus functionally comparable to the Irish *rī* or petty-king. In this position he is the replacement of the earlier *rēx*. The latter term was reapplied to a newer, and far more powerful office of kingship, the (at least partially) Etruscan *rēx*. In function the Roman monarch had little in common with the Indo-European \**rēg-s*, or the Irish *rī*; traces of the sacral aspect of his original function are carried over in the office of the *rēx sacrōrum (sacrificulus)*. It is a curious irony to reflect on the fact that it is primarily to the Etruscans that we owe the preservation in Latin—alone among the Italic languages<sup>46</sup>—of the ancient Indo-European term for ‘king’.

The preceding pages, the final portion of this study, will have served

<sup>44</sup> Hoenigswald points out that another very probable Etruscan loanword in Latin, *idus*, shares with *tribus* the structural rarity of being a feminine *u*-stem.

<sup>45</sup> Whatmough, *op. cit.* 393–395.

<sup>46</sup> The feminine derivative occurs in Marrucinian, but only as a divine name: (Vetter 218) *regen[ai] peai cerie iouia* ‘Reginae Piae Ceriae Iouiae’.

their purpose if they have shown that the considerations of a set of data in Celtic (in our case the institutions of tribe and kingship, together with their linguistic expression) may serve as a productive frame of reference in which to explain a related set of data in Italic. In this manner it may prove useful to consider Italic and Celtic together; but in no sense have we spoken, or should we speak, of an Italo-Celtic unity, either as a language, or as a culture.

The notion of "common languages"—Common Greek, Common Slavic, etc., on the one hand, Indo-Iranian, Balto-Slavic, Italo-Celtic on the other—is probably our most important single inheritance today from Schleicher's *Stammbaum*.<sup>47</sup> The first type we use every day; the second type we use according to the particular group and the given scholar.

The utility of such a notion as Common Greek cannot, I think, honestly be questioned, so long as we understand it to mean the set of linguistic features—both "retentions" and "innovations," or "divergences"—that serves to specify uniquely and set off all attested forms of Greek from (a) Indo-European itself, and (b) all other Indo-European "common languages." Such a definition is purely operational, and an analytical tool. It makes no specific supposition that there ever existed a community that spoke Common Greek as so defined. For example, certain of the features included in the specification may be incompatible at a given time; the same is true for what we specify as Common Indo-European. On the other hand it in no way excludes the possibility that such a community may have in fact existed; in this sense, the notion of Common Greek is not a fiction. But whether such a community existed or not is, from the point of view of the linguistic definition of Common Greek, irrelevant.

For the second type of "common language," for example, Balto-Slavic, we are in a somewhat different situation. When we posit a Common Slavic and a Common Baltic, defined as above, it would appear that a Common Balto-Slavic is not possible, since Common Baltic is *inter alia* that which differentiates Baltic from Slavic, and vice versa. But, if Common Baltic and Common Slavic are identical in large part, in respect to the set of features specified, then it may be more efficient to combine them into a single common language. A single grammar can account for both. Indo-Iranian is such a case; though there do exist notable differences between the two groups—not least, perhaps, is the quite extraordinary lack of resemblance between modern Indo-Aryan languages and modern Iranian languages—it is doubtless the intuitive

<sup>47</sup> No matter what we may feel about the *Stammbaum*, let us not forget that it was that model that first demonstrated that Sanskrit was not "Indo-European" itself, but a derivative of Indo-European, like everything else.

recognition of the precision of the identities between Common Indie and Common Iranian which led B. Delbrück in 1880 to retain the subgrouping of Indo-Iranian alone among the Indo-European languages.<sup>48</sup>

For Balto-Slavic one can entertain some doubts. But the identities are there, and the differences between Letto-Lithuanian and Old Prussian are sometimes greater than the differences between Letto-Lithuanian and Common Slavic. Hence we may leave the question of a Common Balto-Slavic open; V. V. Ivanov and V. N. Toporov suggest in fact that the grammar of Slavie is only a development of the grammar of Baltic.<sup>49</sup>

For Italo-Celtic, however, it seems evident that the consideration and comparison of Common Celtic and Common Italic, together with the not inconsiderable difficulties of the latter as a viable notion, would totally exclude any question of a common language. Common Celtic and Common Italic simply do not agree in the vast majority of instances; they cannot be superimposed one on the other. They show certain similarities, indeed. But these may be shared by the one group or the other with Germanic, or Greek, or Tocharian, or Hittite, or, finally, with Indo-Iranian (*marginalità*). We have, in the last analysis, two separate Indo-European language groups in recorded history, and (at least) two separate entities in prehistory, as defined above: Common Celtic and Common Italic.

(*Participants in the discussion following the conference presentation of the first version of this paper: Cowgill, Senn, Hoenigswald, Hamp, Emeneau, Birnbaum, Polomé.*)

---

<sup>48</sup> *Einleitung in das Sprachstudium* 137.

<sup>49</sup> K postanovke voprosa o drevnejšix otноšenijax baltijskix i slavjanskix jazykov, IV Meždunar. Sjezd Slavistov. Doklady (Moscow, 1958), esp. p. 39.